

REMARKS

Claims 1 through 30 are pending. Claims 1, 9, 14, 20, 25, 27 and 29 have been amended.

The claims were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102 as being anticipated by Hurtado et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,611,812). Applicant has amended claim 1 to clarify that “the second sequence identifier is sequentially related to the first sequence identifier.” Support for this amendment can be found, for example, on page 4, line 22 to page 5, line 4; on page 9, lines 14 – 19; page 10, lines 11 – 17; and with reference to FIG. 4. No new matter has been added.

One skilled in the art will recognize that certain advantages may result from implementing the features recited in the claims. For example, the amount of processing overhead at certain routers may be reduced. *See, e.g.*, page 11, lines 14 – 17.

The Hurtado et al. patent discloses an encryption process that includes encrypting 301 content with a randomly generated symmetric key, running 302 the encrypted content through a hash algorithm to produce a content digest, encrypting 303 the symmetric key with an intended recipient's public key, running 304 the encrypted symmetric key through the hash algorithm to produce a symmetric key digest, running 305 the concatenation of the content digest and symmetric key digest through the hash algorithm to produce a secure container (“SC(s)”) digest, encrypting 306 the SC(s) digest with the sender's private key to produce a digital signature for the SC(s), creating 307A an SC(s) file and sending 307B the SC(s) file. *See*, Hurtado, column 18, lines 34 – 62.

The Hurtado et al. patent fails to either disclose or suggest “sending a first message containing a first sequence identifier . . . and subsequently sending a second message with a second sequence identifier [that] is sequentially related to the first sequence identifier” as recited by claim 1. Indeed, the Hurtado et al. patent does not even mention sequence identifiers. Moreover, none of the content that is encrypted according to the techniques disclosed in the Hurtado et al. patent “is sequentially related to” previously transmitted content.

For at least the foregoing reasons, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of this rejection and allowance of claim 1. Claims 2 – 8 depend from claim 1 and should therefore be allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 1.

Applicant asserts that claims 2 – 8 should be allowable for other reasons as well.

For example, claim 2 recites “wherein each authentication key has a specified lifetime and the lifetime of the second key expires prior to the lifetime of the first key.” The Hurtado et al. patent discloses an “E value” associated with a secure container. *See*, column 43, line 41 – 48. This E value “identifies the date, and optionally, the time that the SC(s) [secure container] expires.” *Id.* (emphasis added). A “secure container” is not an “authentication key.” The Hurtado et al. patent fails to disclose or suggest an authentication key having a specified lifetime, as recited by claim 2. Furthermore, the Hurtado et al. patent also fails to disclose or suggest the lifetime of a second key expiring prior to the lifetime of a first key, as also recited by claim 2. The Hurtado et al. patent does not mention the notion of authentication keys having specified lifetimes. For at least these additional reasons, claim 2 should be allowable.

Claim 3 recites “wherein the first key is valid only following an authentication key rollover and the second key was valid at a time prior to the authentication key rollover.” The Hurtado et al. patent simply fails to either disclose or suggest an authentication key rollover. Nor does that patent suggest the particular relationship between the authentication keys and occurrence of a key rollover. For at least this additional reason, claim 3 should be allowable.

Applicant has amended each of the other independent claims 9, 14, 20, 25, 27 and 29 in a manner similar to the claim 1 amendment discussed above. For at least the reasons stated above with regard to claim 1, each pending independent claim also should be allowable. Each of claims 10 – 13, 15 – 19, 21 – 24, 26 and 30 depends from an allowable claim and should, therefore, also be allowable for at least the same reasons. Furthermore, certain of those dependent claims include features that are similar to the features of claims 2 and 3. Those claims should be allowable for at least the additional reasons discussed above regarding claims 2 and 3.

It is believed that all of the pending claims have been addressed. However, the absence of a reply to a specific rejection, issue or comment does not signify agreement with or concession of that rejection, issue or comment. In addition, because the arguments made above may not be exhaustive, there may be reasons for patentability of any or all pending claims (or other claims) that have not been expressed. Finally, nothing in this paper should be construed as

Applicant : Jacek Szyszko
Serial No. : 09/734,834
Filed : December 11, 2000
Page : 13 of 13


Attorney's Docket No.: 10559-369001 / P10175
Assignee : Intel Corporation

an intent to concede any issue with regard to any claim, except as specifically stated in this paper, and the amendment of any claim does not necessarily signify concession of unpatentability of the claim prior to its amendment.

In view of the above remarks, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of each of the rejections and allowance of the application. No fee is believed due, but if there is a fee deficiency, please charge Deposit Account 06-1050.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 10/15/01



Samuel Borodach
Reg. No. 38,388

Fish & Richardson P.C., Attorneys for Intel
Citigroup Center
52nd Floor
153 East 53rd Street
New York, New York 10022-4611
Telephone: (212) 765-5070
Facsimile: (212) 258-2291